

REMARKS

This paper is in response to the Advisory Action mailed April 20, 2006 and is supplemental to the Amendment and Response Under 37 CFR 1.116 filed March 21, 2006 in response to the Final Office Action mailed February 28, 2006.

Claim 1 is amended, claims 2, 6, 7, 21-25 are canceled, and claims 32-39 are added; as a result, claims 1, 5 and 26-39 are now pending in this application.

Interview Summary

Applicant thanks Examiner Monica Lewis for the courtesy of a telephone interview on May 26, 2006 with Applicant's representative Andrew R. Peret. Applicant's attorney and Examiner Lewis agreed that the amended claims appear to be allowable but Examiner Lewis indicated that further searching may be required. The Examiner also confirmed that claims 26-31 should have been declared as allowed in the previous Office Action.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2, 6, 7 and 26-31 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 1, 5 and 39

Applicant has amended claim 1 to include all of the limitations of claim 2 which was objected to by the Examiner as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but was indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of base claim 1 and any intervening claims (of which there are none).

Applicant notes claims 5 and 39 depend from claim 1 such that claims 5 and 39 incorporate all of the limitations of claim 1. Therefore, claims 5 and 39 should be allowed for the reasons provided above with regard to claim 1 (among other reasons).

Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1, 5 and 39 are respectfully requested.

Claims 32-35

Applicant has added new claim 32 such that claim 32 includes all of the limitations of claim 6, intervening claim 5 and base claim 1. Applicant has also specified that the contacts are solder columns. Claim 6 was objected to by the Examiner as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but was indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of base claim 1 and any intervening claims (i.e., claim 5).

Applicant notes claims 33-35 depend from claim 32 such that claims 33-35 incorporate all of the limitations of claim 32. Therefore, claims 33-35 should be allowed for the reasons provided above with regard to claim 32 (among other reasons).

Allowance of claims 32-35 is respectfully requested.

Claims 36-38

Applicant has added new claim 36 such that claim 36 includes all of the limitations of claim 7, intervening claim 5 and base claim 1. Claim 7 was objected to by the Examiner as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but was indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of base claim 1 and any intervening claims (i.e. claim 5).

Applicant notes claims 37-38 depend from claim 36 such that claims 37-38 incorporate all of the limitations of claim 36. Therefore, claims 37-38 should be allowed for the reasons provided above with regard to claim 36 (among other reasons).

Allowance of claims 36-38 is respectfully requested.

§112 Rejection of the Claims

Claim 21 was rejected under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicant has canceled claim 21 such that the rejection is moot.

§102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1, 5, 22 and 23 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(c) as being anticipated by Damberg (U.S. 2004/0021211). As discussed above, Applicant has amended claim 1 to include all of the limitations of claim 2 which was objected to by the Examiner as being dependent upon

a rejected base claim, but was indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of base claim 1 and any intervening claims (of which there are none). Reconsideration and allowance of claim 1 are respectfully requested.

Applicant notes claims 5 and 39 depend from claim 1 such that claims 5 and 39 incorporate all of the limitations of claim 1. Therefore, claims 5 and 39 should be allowed for the reasons provided above with regard to claim 1 (among other reasons).

Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1, 5 and 39 are respectfully requested.

Reservation of Right to Traverse Statements in the Office Action

Applicant respectfully traverses each of the pending rejections, and reserves the right to traverse any statement that was made in the Office Actions relating to the pending rejections. Applicant is expressly not admitting to any assertions that were made in any of the Office Actions.

Reservation of Right to Swear Behind References

Applicant reserves the right to swear behind any references which are cited in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §§102(a), 102(e), 103/102(a), and 103/102(e). Statements distinguishing the claimed subject matter over the cited references are not to be interpreted as admissions that the references are prior art.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicants' attorney, Andrew Peret at 262-646-7009 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

IWEN CHAO ET AL.

By their Representatives,
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
(612) 349-9592

By / Andrew Peret _____ /
Andrew R. Peret
Reg. No. 41,246